arXiv:1602.08672v1 [math.DS] 28 Feb 2016

Spectral theory for nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight functions and applications

Wenxian Shen
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36849, U.S.A.

Xiaoxia Xie
Department of Applied Mathematics
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, IL 60616, U.S.A.

Abstract. In this paper, we study the spectral theory for nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight functions subject to Dirichlet type, Neumann type and spatial periodic type boundary conditions. We first obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a unique positive principal spectrum point for such operators. We then investigate upper bounds of principal spectrum points and sufficient conditions for the principal spectrum points to be principal eigenvalues. Finally we discuss the applications to nonlinear mathematical models from biology.

Key words. Nonlocal dispersal operator, time periodic weight function, principal spectrum point, principal eigenvalue, KPP equations

Mathematics subject classification. 45C05, 45M05, 45M20, 47G10, 92D25.

1 Introduction

Random dispersal operators, such as $u(t,\cdot) \mapsto \Delta u(t,\cdot)$ with proper boundary condition, are often adopted in modeling dissipative systems in applied sciences when the organisms in the systems move randomly between the adjacent spatial locations (see [7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 38, 52], etc.). Nonlocal dispersal operators, such as $u(t,\cdot) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} k(y-\cdot)[u(t,y)-u(t,\cdot)]dy$, are applied in modeling diffusive systems in applied sciences when the systems exhibit long range internal interactions (see [20, 21, 25, 33, 34, 36, 45, 50, 51], etc.). Diffusive evolution equations with both random and nonlocal dispersals have been widely studied on one hand. On the other hand, there are still many important dynamical issues for such systems which are not well understood yet.

The current paper is devoted to the study of principal spectrum points/principal eigenvalues of nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight functions and Dirichlet type, Neumann type, and periodic boundary conditions. More precisely, the eigenvalue problem subject to Dirichlet type boundary condition considered in this paper reads as

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - u(t,x) + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x)u(t,x) = 0, \quad x \in \bar{D}, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain and $m_1(t,x) \not\equiv 0$ is a continuous, time periodic weight function; the eigenvalue problem subject to Neumann type boundary condition considered in this paper reads as

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \int_D \kappa(y-x)[u(t,y)-u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_2 m_2(t,x)u(t,x) = 0, \quad x \in \bar{D}, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $D \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $m_2(t,x)$ are as (1.1); and the eigenvalue problem subject to periodic boundary conditions considered in this paper reads as

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(y-x)[u(t,y)-u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_3 m_3(t,x)u(t,x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x+p_j\mathbf{e_j}) = u(t,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where $p_j > 0$, $\mathbf{e_j} = (\delta_{j_1}, \delta_{j_2}, \cdots, \delta_{jN})$ ($\delta_{jk} = 1$ if $j = k$ and $\delta_{jk} = 0$ if $j \neq k$), and $m_3(t,x)$ is a continuous function with $m_3(t+T,x) = m_3(t,x+p_j\mathbf{e_j}) = m_3(t,x)$ for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. Throughout the paper, we assume that the nonlocal kernel function $\kappa(\cdot)$ in (1.1)-(1.3) satisfies the following condition

$$\kappa(\cdot) \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^N), \ \ \kappa(0) > 0, \ \kappa(-z) = \kappa(z), \ \ \text{and} \ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(z)dz = 1. \tag{K}$$

The eigenvalue problems (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) can be viewed as the nonlocal dispersal counterparts of the following eigenvalue problems associated to random dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite functions and Dirichlet, Neumann, and periodic boundary conditions,

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \Delta u(t,x) + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x)u(t,x) = 0 & x \in D, \\ u(t,x) = 0, & x \in \partial D, \\ u(t,x) = u(t+T,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \Delta u(t,x) + \lambda_2 m_2(t,x)u(t,x) = 0 & x \in D, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(t,x) = 0, & x \in \partial D, \\ u(t,x) = u(t+T,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \Delta u(t,x) + \lambda_3 m_3(t,x) u(t,x) = 0 \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x+p_j \mathbf{e_j}) = u(t,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

respectively (see [49] and references therein for the relation between nonlocal dispersal operators with Dirichlet type, Neumann type, and periodic boundary conditions, and random dispersal operators with Dirichlet, Neumann, and periodic boundary conditions).

The eigenvalue problems of random dispersal operators with indefinite weight functions have been extensively for more than two decades (see, e.g. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 29, 32, 37, 41, 47] and references therein). For $i = 1$ ($i = 2$, or $i = 3$, respectively), recall that a real number $\lambda_1^{r,p}$ ($\lambda_2^{r,p}$ or $\lambda_3^{r,p}$, respectively) is called a *principal eigenvalue* of (1.4) ((1.5), or (1.6), respectively) if (1.4) ((1.5), or (1.6), respectively) with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1^{r,p}$ ($\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^{r,p}$, or $\lambda_3 = \lambda_3^{r,p}$, respectively) has a positive solution (called *eigenfunction*). The eigenvalue problem (1.4), (1.5), or (1.6) are closely related to the following regular eigenvalue problems,

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \Delta u(t,x) + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x) u(t,x) = \mu_1 u(t,x) & x \in D, \\ u(t,x) = 0, & x \in \partial D, \\ u(t,x) = u(t+T,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \Delta u(t,x) + \lambda_2 m_2(t,x) u(t,x) = \mu_2 u(t,x) & x \in D, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(t,x) = 0, & x \in \partial D, \\ u(t,x) = u(t+T,x), \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \Delta u(t,x) + \lambda_3 m_3(t,x) u(t,x) = \mu_3 u(t,x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x+p_j \mathbf{e_j}) = u(t,x). \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

For $i = 1, 2, 3$, and any given λ_i, let $\mu_i^{r,p}(\lambda_i)$ be the principal eigenvalue of (1.7), (1.8), and (1.9), respectively. Then $\lambda_1^{r,p}$ (resp. $\lambda_2^{r,p}$, $\lambda_3^{r,p}$) is a principal eigenvalues of (1.4) (resp. (1.5), (1.6)) if and only if $\mu_1^r(\lambda_1^{r,p}) = 0$ (resp. $\mu_2^r(\lambda_2^{r,p}) = 0$, $\mu_3^r(\lambda_3^{r,p}) = 0$).

Thanks to its applications in the nonlinear mathematical models, in particular, the population dynamics in biology, the existence of positive principal eigenvalues of (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6) is of particular interest and has been well studied. The time independent version was first studied by Manes and Micheletti in [42]. Then, Hess and Kato in [29] and Brown and Lin in [8] obtained some results for elliptic operators in Dirichlet boundary case. The proofs of Brown and Lin and Manes and Micheletti are based on the variational characterization of the principal eigenvalue; the proof of Hess and Kato uses Krein-Rutman's theorem. For more general elliptic operators subject to various boundary conditions, we refer to [5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 24, 27, 29, 39, 40, 47] and references therein, and for the applications in population dynamics, such as the optimization of spatial arrangement of favorable and unfavorable regions for a species to survive in biological context, we refer to [9, 11, 13, 14, 32, 37, 41], etc.

Among others, in the time independent case, it is proved that (1.4) with $m_1(t,x) = m_1(x)$ admits a unique positive principal eigenvalue if and only if

$$m(x_0) > 0 \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in D \tag{1.10}$$

(see [24, 29, 27]), and (1.5) with $m_2(t,x) = m_2(x)$ admits a unique positive principal eigenvalue if and only if

$$m_2(x_0) > 0 \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in D \text{ and } \int_D m_2(x)dx < 0 \tag{1.11}$$

(see [27]). In the time periodic case, it is proved that (1.4) has a unique positive principal eigenvalue if and only if

$$\int_0^T \max_{x\in\bar{D}} m_1(t,x)dt > 0 \tag{R-D}$$

(see [28]), and (1.5) has a unique positive principal eigenvalue if

$$\int_0^T \max_{x\in\bar{D}} m_2(t,x)dt > 0 \text{ and } \int_D \int_0^T m_2(t,x)dtdx < 0 \tag{R-N}$$

(see [28]). There is no result for random dispersal operator subject to the spatial periodic boundary condition so far. But as we can see in the proofs for nonlocal dispersal operator, results in spatial periodic boundary case are very similar to those in Neumann boundary case.

The study of (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) is of great interest in its own and will also have important applications in the study of many nonlinear mathematical models with nonlocal dispersal from applied science, including the following time periodic dispersal evolution equations,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - u(t,x) + \lambda_1 u f_1(t,x,u), \quad x\in\bar{D}, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x), \\ u(0,x)\geq 0, u(0,x)\not\equiv 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \int_D k(y-x)[u(t,y)-u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_2 u f_2(t,x,u), \quad x\in\bar{D}, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x), \\ u(0,x)\geq 0, u(0,x)\not\equiv 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} k(y-x)u(t,y)dy - u(t,x) + \lambda_3 u f_3(t,x,u), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(t+T,x+p_i\mathbf{e_i}) = u(t,x+p_i\mathbf{e_i}) = u(t,x), \\ u(0,x)\geq 0, u(0,x)\not\equiv 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

where $u(0,x)$ is continuous and bounded, $\lambda_i > 0$, and $f_i(t,x,u)$ satisfies the following condition ($i = 1,2,3$),

(F) *f_i is C^1 in $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and C^3 in $(x,u)\in\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}$; $f_i(t,x,u) < 0$ for $u \gg 1$ and $\partial_u f_i(t,x,u) < 0$ for $u \geq 0$; $f_i(t+T,x,u) = f_i(t,x,u)$;* and when $i=3$, $f_i(t+T,x,u) = f_i(t,x+p_j\mathbf{e_j},u) = f(t,x,u)$ for $j = 1,2,\cdots,N$.

In (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14), $u(t,x)$ represents the density of a species at location x and time t, and $\lambda_i f(t,x,0)(i=1,2,3)$ represents the intrinsic growth rate of a species. Hence only non-negative solutions of (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14) are of interest. Notice that $u\equiv 0$ is a solution to (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14). It is of great interest to know for which λ_1 (resp. λ_2, λ_3), there is a positive solution of (1.12) (resp. (1.13), (1.14)). As in the random dispersal case, the spectral theory for the eigenvalue problems (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) will play an important role in the study of positive solutions of (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14)).

However, little is known about the eigenvalue problems of nonlocal dispersal operators with (time periodic) indefinite weight functions. The objective of this paper is to investigate the principal spectrum points /eigenvalues (if exists) of the nonlocal time-periodic weighted eigenvalue problems with Dirichlet type boundary condition (1.1), Neumann type boundary condition (1.2) and spatial periodic type boundary condition (1.3), respectively. Note that, unlike random dispersal operators, a nonlocal dispersal operator may not have a principal eigenvalue (see [15, 50] for examples). We hence first introduce the notion of the principal spectrum points of (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3), which are the natural generalization

of notion of the principal eigenvalue of (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6). Moreover, due to the lack of compactness of nonlocal operators, the Krein-Rutman's theorem is not applicable, and there is in general no variational characterization for time-periodic nonlocal dispersal operators. We overcome the difficulties by developing various new techniques, and prove the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of positive principal spectrum points of (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3), respectively. We also investigate the upper bounds of principal spectrum points and the sufficient conditions for the principal spectrum points to be principal eigenvalues. As an application, we study asymptotic dynamics of (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14) by the spectral theory of weighted nonlocal dispersal operators.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce notations, definitions and state the main results of the paper. In section 3, we present some preliminary materials to be used in the proof of the main results. We prove the main results and discuss the application of the main results in section 4.

2 Notations, Definitions, and Main Results

In this section, we introduce notations, definitions, and state the main results.

We first introduce some standing notations and the concept of principal spectrum points of nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight functions.

Let

$$\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 = \{u \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \bar{D}, \mathbb{R}) | u(t+T, x) = u(t, x)\} \tag{2.1}$$

with norm $\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_i} = \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\bar{D}} |u(t,x)| (i = 1, 2)$,

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = \{u \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}) | u(t+T, x) = u(t, x + p_j \mathbf{e_j}) = u(t, x) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \cdots, N\} \tag{2.2}$$

with norm $\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_3} = \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\mathbb{R}^N} |u(t,x)|$. Set

$$\mathcal{X}_i^+ = \{u \in \mathcal{X}_i | u \geq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{X}_i^{++} = \text{Int} X_i^+ = \{\phi \in \mathcal{X}_i, \phi > 0\}$$

$(i = 1, 2, 3)$. We define the integral operator K_i, the multiplication operator B_i, and the domain D_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ as follows,

$$K_i : \mathcal{X}_i \to \mathcal{X}_i,\ K_i u(t,x) = \begin{cases} \int_D \kappa(y-x) u(t,y) dy & \forall u \in X_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(y-x) u(t,y) dy & \forall u \in X_3, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

$$B_i : \mathcal{X}_i \to \mathcal{X}_i, B_i u = b_i u \quad \text{with} \quad b_i(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 1, 3, \\ \int_D \kappa(y-x) dy & \text{for } i = 2, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$D_i = \begin{cases} D & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \\ [0, p_1] \times [0, p_2] \times [0, p_N] & \text{for } i = 3. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

For $1 \leq i \leq 3$, set

$$(\mathcal{L}_i u)(t,x) = -\partial_t u(t,x) + (K_i u)(t,x) - (B_i u)(t,x) \tag{2.6}$$

with domain

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}_i) = \{u \in \mathcal{X}_i | u \text{ is } C^1 \text{ in } t \text{ and } u_t \in \mathcal{X}_i\}.$$

Then for $i = 1, 2, 3$, the eigenvalue problems (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) in the space $\mathcal{X}_i$ can be written uniformly as

$$\mathcal{L}_i u + \lambda_i m_i u = 0, \tag{2.7}$$

Observe that $K_2 = K_1$, $B_3 = B_1$ and $D_2 = D_1$. The introduction of K_2, B_3, and D_2 is for convenience.

For any given real number λ_i, the weighted eigenvalue problem (2.7) is closely related to the following regular eigenvalue problem on $\mathcal{X}_i$,

$$\mathcal{L}_i u + \lambda_i m_i u = \mu_i u. \tag{2.8}$$

Let $\sigma_i(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ be the spectrum set of (2.8) (i.e. the spectrum set of the operator $\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i$ in $\mathcal{X}_i$) and

$$\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) = \sup\{\mathrm{Re}\mu | \mu \in \sigma_i(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)\}.$$

Definition 2.1. *(1) $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ is called the principal spectrum point of the regular eigenvalue problem* (2.8)*. The principal spectrum point $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ is called the principal eigenvalue of* (2.8) *if* (2.8) *with $\mu_i = \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ has a positive solution in $\mathcal{X}_i$.*

(2) A real number $\lambda_i^p(m_i)$ is called a principal spectrum point of the weighted eigenvalue problem (2.7) *if $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^p(m_i)m_i) = 0$. When $\lambda_i^p(m_i)$ is a principal spectrum point of* (2.7) *and $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^p(m_i)m_i)$ is a principal eigenvalue of* (2.8)*, $\lambda_i^p(m_i)$ is also called a principal eigenvalue of* (2.7)*.*

If not confusion occurs, we may write $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ and $\lambda_i^p(m_i)$ as $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ and λ_i^p, respectively.

Let

$$X_1 = X_2 = \{u \in C(\bar{D}, \mathbb{R})\}$$

with norm $\|u\|_{X_i} = \sup_{x\in\bar{D}} |u(x)|$ $(i = 1, 2)$,

$$X_3 = \{u \in C(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}) \,|\, u(x + p_j \mathbf{e_j}) = u(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N,\, j = 1, 2, \cdots, N\}$$

with norm $\|u\|_{X_3} = \max_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|$. Set

$$X_i^+ = \{u \in X_i \,|\, u \geq 0\},$$

and

$$X_i^{++} = \begin{cases} \{u \in X_i^+ \,|\, u(x) > 0, \quad x \in \bar{D}\}, & i = 1, 2, \\ \{u \in X_i^+ \,|\, u(x) > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N\}, & i = 3. \end{cases}$$

In the case that $m_i(t, x) \equiv m_i(x)$, consider

$$K_i u - B_i u + \lambda_i m_i u = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$K_i u - B_i u + \lambda_i m_i u = \mu_i u, \tag{2.10}$$

in X_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$. Similarly, define *the principal spectrum point* $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ of the regular eigenvalue problem (2.10) to be the largest real part of the spectrum set of (2.10). We then call a real number λ_i^p *the principal spectrum point* of the weighted eigenvalue problem (2.9) if $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^p) = 0$.

Note that when $m_i(t, x) \equiv m_i(x)$, the principal spectrum point of (2.8) and the principal spectrum point of (2.10) are the same (see Proposition 3.4).

Note also that (2.8), as well as its time independent version (2.10), is an eigenvalue problem in regular sense for $i = 1, 2, 3$, as we can see from Definition 2.1 (1). Many properties of the principal spectrum

point/principal eigenvalue have been studied extensively (see [3, 15, 35, 46, 49, 50] etc.). And we will recall the basic properties and prove some new properties of the principal spectrum point/principal eigenvalue of (2.8) in subsection 3.3.

However, little is known about the eigenvalue problem (2.7). We are the first to study the principal spectrum point/principal eigenvalue of nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight function. Definition 2.1 (2) is a natural generalization of the principal eigenvalue of random dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight functions. And the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of positive principal spectrum point of (2.7) are in Theorem 2.1-2.3, and the properties of the principal spectrum point of (2.7) are in Theorem 2.4.

For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let

$$\widehat{m}_i(x) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T m_i(t,x)dt, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\widehat{m}_{i,\max} = \max_{x\in\bar{D}_i} m_i(x), \text{ and } \widehat{m}_{i,\min} = \min_{x\in\bar{D}_i} m_i(x), \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}(m_i) = \int_0^T \max_{x\in\bar{D}_i} m_i(t,x)dt. \tag{2.13}$$

We now state the main results of the paper. We first state the main results on the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of positive principal spectrum points of (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3).

Theorem 2.1 (Necessary and sufficient condition in the Dirichlet boundary case)**.** *Suppose $\kappa(\cdot)$ satisfies (K) and $m_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$. The eigenvalue problem* (1.1) *has exactly one positive principal spectrum point, denoted by λ_1^p, if and only if*

$$\mathcal{P}(m_1) > 0. \tag{D}$$

More precisely, we show the following.

(1) There is $\lambda_1^p > 0$ such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p) = 0$ if and only if (D) holds.

(2) If $\lambda_1^{p,1}, \lambda_1^{p,2} > 0$ are such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = 0$, then $\lambda_1^{p,1} = \lambda_1^{p,2}$.

Corollary 2.1.

(1) If $m_1(t,x) \equiv m_1(t)$, then (1.1) *has exactly one positive principal spectrum point λ_1^p if and only if*

$$\int_0^T m_1(t)dt > 0.$$

Moreover, λ_1^p is a principal eigenvalue of (1.1) *and $\lambda_1^p = \dfrac{-\bar{\lambda}_1}{\widehat{m}_1}$, where $\bar{\lambda}_1 (< 0)$ is the principal eigenvalue of $K_1 - B_1 (= K_1 - \mathcal{I})$.*

(2) If $m_1(t,x) \equiv m_1(x)$, consider

$$\left[\int_D \kappa(y-x)dy - u(x)\right] + \lambda_1 m_1(x)u(x) = 0, \quad x \in \bar{D}. \tag{2.14}$$

There exists a unique positive principal spectrum point λ_1^p of (2.14) *if and only if $m_1(x_0) > 0$ for $x_0 \in D_1$.*

Remark 2.1. *Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1 extend the principal eigenvalue theory for random dispersal operators with time independent or time periodic indefinite weight functions subject to Dirichlet boundary condition to nonlocal dispersal operators with time independent or time periodic indefinite weight functions subject to Dirichlet type boundary condition.*

Theorem 2.2 (Necessary and sufficient condition in the Neumann boundary case)**.** *Suppose that $\kappa(\cdot)$ satisfies (K), $m_2(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{X}_2$ and $m_2(t,x) \not\equiv m_2(t)$. The eigenvalue problem* (1.2) *has exactly one positive principal spectrum point, denoted by λ_2^p, if and only if*

$$\mathcal{P}(m_2) > 0 \text{ and } \int_{D_2}\int_0^T m_2(t,x)dtdx < 0. \tag{N}$$

More precisely, we show the following.

(1) There is a $\lambda_2^p > 0$ such that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^p) = 0$ if and only if (N) holds.

(2) If $\lambda_2^{p,1}, \lambda_2^{p,2} > 0$ are such that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,1}) = \mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,2}) = 0$, then $\lambda_2^{p,1} = \lambda_2^{p,2}$.

Corollary 2.2. *(1) If $m_2(t,x) \equiv m_2(t)$, then*

$$\mu_2^n(\lambda_2) = \lambda_2 \widehat{m}_2.$$

It then follows that, if $\int_0^T m_2(t)dt \neq 0$, then there is no positive principal spectrum point of (1.2)*, and if $\int_0^T m_2(t)dt = 0$, then any $\lambda_2 > 0$ is a positive principal spectrum point of* (1.2)*.*

(2) If $m_2(t,x) \equiv m_2(x)$, consider

$$\int_D \kappa(y-x)[u(y)-u(x)]dy + \lambda_2 m_2(x)u(x) = 0, \quad x \in \bar{D}. \tag{2.15}$$

There is exactly one positive principal spectrum point λ_2^p of (2.15) *if and only if*

$$m_2(x_0) > 0 \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in D_2 \quad \text{and} \int_{D_2} m_2(x)dx < 0.$$

Remark 2.2. *Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.2 extend the principal eigenvalue theory for random dispersal operators with time independent or time periodic indefinite weight functions subject to Neumann boundary condition to nonlocal dispersal operators with time independent or time periodic indefinite weight functions subject to Neumann type boundary condition.*

Theorem 2.3 (Necessary and sufficient condition in the periodic boundary case)**.** *Suppose that $\kappa(\cdot)$ satisfies (K), $m_3(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{X}_3$, and $m_3(t,x) \not\equiv m_3(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The eigenvalue problem* (1.3) *has exactly one positive principal spectrum point, denoted by λ_3^p, if and only if*

$$\mathcal{P}(m_3) > 0 \text{ and } \int_{D_3}\int_0^T m_3(t,x)dtdx < 0. \tag{P}$$

More precisely, we show the following.

(1) There is a $\lambda_3^p > 0$ such that $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3^p) = 0$ if and only if (P) holds.

(2) If $\lambda_3^{p,1}, \lambda_3^{p,2} > 0$ are such that $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3^{p,1}) = \mu_3^n(\lambda_3^{p,2}) = 0$, then $\lambda_3^{p,1} = \lambda_3^{p,2}$.

Corollary 2.3. *(1) If $m_3(t,x) = m_3(t)$, then*

$$\mu_3^n(\lambda_3) = \lambda_3 \widehat{m}_3.$$

It then follows that, if $\int_0^T m_3(t)dt \neq 0$, then there is no positive principal spectrum point of (1.3), and if $\int_0^T m_3(t)dt = 0$, then any $\lambda_3 > 0$ is a positive principal spectrum point of (1.3).

(2) If $m_3(t,x) \equiv m_3(x)$, consider

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(y-x)[u(y)-u(x)]dy + \lambda_3 m_3(x)u(x) = 0. \tag{2.16}$$

There is exactly one positive principal spectrum point λ_3^p of (2.16) if and only if

$$m_3(x_0) > 0 \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in D_3, \quad \text{and } \int_{D_3} m_3(x)dx < 0.$$

Next, we state the main result on the upper bounds of principal spectrum points of (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3), and sufficient conditions for the principal spectrum points of (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) to be principal eigenvalues.

Consider the eigenvalue problem with indefinite weight function $\hat{m}_i$,

$$K_i u - B_i u + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i u = 0, \tag{2.17}$$

and the regular eigenvalue problem

$$K_i u - B_i u + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i u = \mu_i(\lambda_i) u \tag{2.18}$$

in X_i.

Theorem 2.4 (Properties of the principal spectrum points)**.**

(1) (Upper bounds) If (2.17) has a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_i^p(\widehat{m}_i)$, then (2.7) has also a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_i^p(m_i)$ and

$$\lambda_i^p(m_i) \leq \lambda_i^p(\widehat{m}_i).$$

(2) (Sufficient conditions of the existence of positive principal eigenvalues)

(i) Assume that $N = 1$ or 2, $b_i + \widehat{m}_i$ is C^N, and (2.7) has a unique positive principal spectrum point λ_i^p, then λ_i^p is a positive principal eigenvalue of (2.7).

(ii) For $N \geq 1$, and $i = 1$ or 3, assume that $\int_{D_i} \frac{1}{\widehat{m}_{i,\max} - \widehat{m}_i(x)} dx = \infty$ and (2.7) has a unique positive principal spectrum point λ_i^p, then λ_i^p is a positive principal eigenvalue of (2.7).

Remark 2.3. *Assume that $\widehat{m}_i(x_0) > 0$ for some $x_0 \in D_i$, and in addition, $\int_{D_i} \widehat{m}_i(x)dx < 0$ in the case $i = 2, 3$. Then (2.17) has a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_i^p(\widehat{m}_i)$.*

Finally, we consider the applications of the principal spectrum point theory of nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight function to the KPP type equations (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14). And we prove the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *Assume (K) and (F) hold. Denote the principal spectrum point of the eigenvalue problem* (2.8) *with* $m_i(t,x) = f_i(t,x,0)$ *by* $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$. *Assume in addition that* $f_1(t,x,0)$, $f_2(t,x,0)$, *and* $f_3(t,x,0)$ *satisfies (D), (N), (P), respectively. Then* (1.12) *(*(1.13) *or* (1.14)*) admits a unique positive time-periodic solution* $u^*(t,x)$ *if and only if*

$$\lambda_i > \lambda_i^p,$$

where λ_i^p *is the positive number such that* $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^p) = 0$.

3 Preliminary

In this section, we present some notations and preliminary materials to be used in the proofs of the main results in Section 4. We first present a technical lemma in subsection 3.1. Then we present a comparison principle for solutions of some linear nonlocal evolution equations in subsection 3.2. Finally we present some basic properties of principal spectrum points of the regular eigenvalue problem (2.8) in subsection 3.3. Throughout this section, for $1 \le i \le 3$, let

$$h_i(t,x;\lambda_i) = -b_i(x) + \lambda_i m_i(t,x), \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\widehat{h}_i(x;\lambda_i) = -b_i(x) + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i(x), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\widehat{m}_i$ is as in (2.11). For D_i defined in (2.5), set

$$\widehat{h}_{i,\max}(\lambda_i) = \max_{x\in\bar{D}_i} \widehat{h}_i(x;\lambda_i), \quad \text{and } \widehat{h}_{i,\min}(\lambda_i) = \min_{x\in\bar{D}_i} \widehat{h}_i(x;\lambda_i). \tag{3.3}$$

If there is no confusion, we may omit λ_i, and abbreviate the notations in (3.1), (3.2), and (3.3) as $h_i(t,x)$, $\widehat{h}_i(x)$ and $\widehat{h}_{i,\max}$, respectively.

3.1 A technical lemma

In this subsection, we provide a useful technical lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $1 \le i \le 3$. *For any fixed* $0 < \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, *any* $m_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ *and any* $\epsilon > 0$, *there is* $m_{i,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{X}_i$ *satisfying that*

$$\|m_i - m_{i,\epsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}_i} < \epsilon,$$

$b_i(x) + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_{i,\epsilon}(x)$ *is* C^N, $b_i(x) + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_{i,\epsilon}(x)$ *attains its maximum at some* $x_0 \in \mathrm{Int}(D_i)$, *and the derivatives of* $b_i + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_{i,\epsilon}(x)$ *up to order* $N-1$ *at* x_0 *are zero.*

Proof. It follows from [46, Lemma 4.1]. For the self-completeness, we provide a proof in the following.

We prove the case $i = 1$ or 2. The case $i = 3$ can be proved similarly. Without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_i = 1$, and recall that $\widehat{h}_i(x) = -b_i(x) + \widehat{m}_i(x)$ (see (3.2)).

First, let $\tilde{x}_0 \in \bar{D}_i$ be such that

$$\widehat{h}_i(\tilde{x}_0) = \max_{x\in\bar{D}_i} \widehat{h}_i(x).$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\tilde{x}_\epsilon \in \mathrm{Int}(D_i)$ such that

$$\widehat{h}_i(\tilde{x}_0) - \widehat{h}_i(\tilde{x}_\epsilon) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$ be such that

$$B(\tilde{x}_\epsilon, \tilde{\sigma}) \Subset D_i,$$

where $B(\tilde{x}_\epsilon, \tilde{\sigma})$ denotes the open ball with center $\tilde{x}_\epsilon$ and radius $\tilde{\sigma}$.

Note that there is $\xi_i(\cdot) \in C(\bar{D}_i)$ such that $0 \le \xi_i(x) \le 1$, $\xi_i(\tilde{x}_\epsilon) = 1$, and $\text{supp}(\xi_i) \subset B(\tilde{x}_\epsilon, \tilde{\sigma})$. Let

$$\overline{m}_{i,\epsilon}(t,x) = m_i(t,x) + \frac{\epsilon}{3}\xi_i(x),$$

and

$$\overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x) = -b_i(x) + \widehat{m}_i(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{3}\xi_i(x). \tag{3.5}$$

Then $\overline{m}_{i,\epsilon}(t,\cdot)$ and $\overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot)$ is continuous on $\bar{D}_i$,

$$\|\overline{m}_{i,\epsilon}(t,\cdot) - m_i(t,\cdot)\| \le \frac{\epsilon}{3} \tag{3.6}$$

and $\overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot)$ attains its maximum in $\text{Int}(D_i)$.

Let $\widetilde{D}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be such that $D_i \Subset \widetilde{D}_i$. Note that $\overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot)$ can be continuously extended to $\widetilde{D}_i$. Without loss of generality, we may then assume that $\overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $\tilde{D}_i$ and there is $x_0 \in \text{Int}(D_i)$ such that $\overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x_0) = \sup_{x\in\widetilde{D}_i} \overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x)$. Observe that there is $\sigma > 0$ and $\widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot) \in C(\widetilde{D}_i)$ such that $B(x_0,\sigma) \Subset D_i$,

$$0 \le \widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x) \le \frac{\epsilon}{3} \quad \forall\, x \in \widetilde{D}_i, \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x) = \widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x_0) \quad \forall\, x \in B(x_0,\sigma).$$

Let

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} C\exp(\frac{1}{\|x\|^2-1}) & \text{if } \|x\| < 1, \\ \\ 0 & \text{if } \|x\| \ge 1, \end{cases}$$

where $C > 0$ is such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(x)dx = 1$. For given $\delta > 0$, set

$$\eta_\delta(x) = \frac{1}{\delta^N}\eta\left(\frac{x}{\delta}\right).$$

Let

$$h_{i,\epsilon,\delta}(x) = \int_{\widetilde{D}_i} \eta_\delta(y-x)\widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(y)dy.$$

By [19, Theorem 6, Appendix C], $h_{i,\epsilon,\delta}(\cdot)$ is in $C^\infty(\widetilde{D}_i)$ and when $0 < \delta \ll 1$,

$$|h_{i,\epsilon,\delta}(x) - \widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3} \quad \forall\, x \in \bar{D}_i. \tag{3.8}$$

It is not difficulty to see that for $0 < \delta \ll 1$,

$$h_{i,\epsilon,\delta}(x) \le \widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x_0) \quad \forall x \in B(x_0,\sigma),$$

and

$$h_{i,\epsilon,\delta}(x) = \widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x_0) \quad \forall x \in B(x_0,\sigma/2).$$

Fix $0 < \delta \ll 1$. Let

$$\widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x) = h_{i,\epsilon,\delta}(x).$$

Then $\widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot)$ attains its maximum at some $x_0 \in \text{Int}(D_i)$, and the partial derivatives of $\widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon}(\cdot)$ up to order $N-1$ at x_0 are zero. Let

$$m_{i,\epsilon}(t,x) = \overline{m}_{i,\epsilon}(t,x) + \widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x).$$

Then $m_{i,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{X}_2$,

$$\|m_i - m_{2,\epsilon}\| \le \|m_i - \overline{m}_{i,\epsilon}\| + \|\widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon} - \overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}\| \le \|m_i - \overline{m}_{i,\epsilon}\| + \|\widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon} - \widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon}\| + \|\widetilde{h}_{i,\epsilon} - \overline{h}_{i,\epsilon}\| \le \epsilon,$$

and

$$-b_i(x) + \widehat{m}_{i,\epsilon}(x) = \widehat{h}_{i,\epsilon}(x).$$

Therefore, $-b_i + \widehat{m}_{i,\epsilon}$ is C^N, attains its maximum at some point $x_0 \in \mathrm{Int}D_i$, and the partial derivatives of $-b_i + \widehat{m}_{i,\epsilon}$ up to order $N-1$ at x_0 are zero. The lemma is thus proved. □

3.2 Comparison Principle

In this subsection, we present the comparison principle for the solutions to the following evolution equations associated to the eigenvalue problem (2.8) with $\lambda_i \ge 0$,

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - u(t,x) + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x)u(t,x) \quad \text{in } \bar{D}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \int_D \kappa(y-x)[u(t,y) - u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_2 m_2(t,x)u(t,x) \quad \text{in } \bar{D}, \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(y-x)[u(t,y) - u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_3 m_3(t,x)u(t,x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{3.11}$$

where $m_i(t,x) \in \mathcal{X}_i (i = 1,2,3)$.

By general semigroup theory, (3.9) (resp. (3.10), (3.11)) generates evolution families $\{\Phi_1(t,s;m_1)\}$ (resp. $\{\Phi_2(t,s;m_2), \Phi_3(t,s;m_3)\}$) on X_1 (resp. X_2, X_3), that is, for any $u_0 \in X_1$ (resp. $u_0 \in X_2, u_0 \in X_3$), $u(t,x;s,u_0,m_1) := (\Phi_1(t,s;m_1)u_0)(x)$ (resp. $u(t,x;s,u_0,m_2) := (\Phi_2(t,s;m_2)u_0)(x)$, $u(t,x;s,u_0,m_3) := (\Phi_3(t,s;m_3)u_0)(x)$) is the unique solution of (3.9) (resp. (3.10), (3.11)) with $u(s,x;s,u_0,m_1) = u_0(x)$ (resp. $u(s,x;s,u_0,m_2) = u_0(x)$, $u(s,x;s,u_0,m_3) = u_0(x)$).

Definition 3.1. *A bounded measurable function $u(t,x)$ on $[0,T) \times \bar{D}$ is called a super-solution (or sub-solution) of (3.9) if for any $x \in \bar{D}$, $u(t,x)$ is differentiable for all but finite many t's in $[0,T)$ and satisfies that for each $x \in \bar{D}$,*

$$\partial_t u \ge (\ or\ \le) \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - u(t,x) + m_1(t,x)u(t,x)$$

for all but finite many t's in $[0,T)$.

Super-solutions and sub-solutions of (3.10) and (3.11) are defined in an analogous way.

Proposition 3.1 (Comparison principle)**.**

(1) If $u^1(t,x)$ and $u^2(t,x)$ are bounded sub- and super- solution of (3.9) (resp. (3.10), (3.11)) on $[s,T)$, respectively, and $u^1(s,\cdot) \le u^2(s,\cdot)$, then $u^1(t,\cdot) \le u^2(t,\cdot)$ for $t \in [s,T)$.

(2) If $u^1, u^2 \in X_i$, $u^1 \le u^2$ and $u^1 \ne u^2$, then

$$\Phi_i(t,s;m_i)u^1 \ll \Phi_i(t,s;m_i)u^2 \text{ for all } t > s.$$

(3) If $u_0 \in X_i^+$, and $m_i^1, m_i^2 \in \mathcal{X}_i$, if $m_i^1 \le m_i^2$, then

$$\Phi_i(t,s;m_i^1)u_0 \le \Phi_i(t,s;m_i^2)u_0 \text{ for all } t > s.$$

Proof. (1) follows from the arguments in [50, Proposition 3.1 (1)].

(2) follows from the arguments in [50, Proposition 3.1 (2)].

(3) We consider the case $i = 1$. Other cases ca be proved similarly.

Note that $u_1(t, x; s, u_0, m_1^2)$ is a supersolution of (3.9) with m_1 being replaced by m_1^1. Then by (1),

$$u_1(t, \cdot; s, u_0, m_1^1) \leq u_1(t, \cdot; s, u_0, m_1^2) \text{ for all } t > s.$$

□

For simplicity in notation, put $\Phi_i(T; m_i) = \Phi_i(T, 0; m_i)(i = 1, 2, 3)$, and let $r(\Phi_i(T; m_i))$ be the spectral radius of $\Phi_i(T, 0; m_i)$.

3.3 Basic properties of principal spectrum points/principal eigenvalues

Our objective in this subsection is to study some basic properties of the principal spectrum point of the regular eigenvalue problem (2.8).

Recall that in (2.8), $(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)u = -\partial_t u - B_i u + K_i u + \lambda_i m_i u$, and we may use $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ or $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ to denote the principal spectrum point of (2.8), if no confusion occurs. And when $\lambda_i = 0$, we use $\mu_i^n(0)$ to denote the principal $\mathcal{L}_i$.

Proposition 3.2. *For $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) = \frac{\ln r(\Phi_i(T; m_i))}{T}$.*

Proof. It follows from [46, Proposition 3.10]. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Given any $u_0 \in X_i^+ \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\ln \|\Phi_i(t, 0; m_i)u_0\|}{t}.$$

Proof. It follows from the arguments in [35, Proposition 2.5 and Theorem 3.2]. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let $1 \leq i \leq 3$.*

(1) If $m_i(t, x) \equiv m_i(x)$, then the principal spectrum point of (2.8) equals to the principal spectrum point of (2.10).

(2) If $m_i(t, x) \equiv m_i(t)$, then $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) = \mu_i^n(0) + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i$.

Proof. (1) It follows from [49, Proposition 3.3] and Proposition 3.3.

(2) It follows from Proposition 3.3 and the fact that

$$\Phi_i(t, 0; m_i) = e^{\lambda_i \int_0^t m_i(s)ds} \Phi_i(t, 0; 0).$$

□

Recall that $h_i(t, x)$ is defined in (3.1). Set

$$\mathcal{H}_i : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_i) \to \mathcal{X}_i, (\mathcal{H}_i u)(t, x) = -\partial_t u(t, x) + h_i(t, x)u(t, x) \tag{3.12}$$

with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_i) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}_i)$. Note that $\mathcal{H}_i + K_i = \mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i$. Hence, we may use $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{H}_i + K_i)$ or equivalently $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ in different situations to denote the principal spectrum point of the eigenvalue problem (2.8). We use $\mathcal{R}e\{\sigma(\mathcal{H}_i)\}$ to denote the real part of the spectrum set of $\mathcal{H}_i$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $1 \le i \le 3$.*

(1) $\mathcal{R}e\{\sigma(\mathcal{H}_i)\} = [\widehat{h}_{i,\min}, \widehat{h}_{i,\max}]$.

(2) $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) \ge \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i) \ge \widehat{h}_{i,\max}$.

(3) $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ *is the principal eigenvalue if and only if* $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) > \widehat{h}_{i,\max}$.

Proof. (1) It follows from Lemma 3.7 in [35].

(2) $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) \ge \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i)$ follows from [46, Theorem C], and $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i \widehat{m}_i) \ge \widehat{h}_{i,\max}$ follows from Proposition 3.4 (1) and [48, Proposition 3.9].

(3) It follows from [46, Theorem A]. □

For fixed λ_i, let (S1), (S2), and (S3) be the following standing assumptions.

(S1) *For $1 \le i \le 3$, $\widehat{h}_i(\cdot;\lambda_i)$ is C^N, there is some $x_0 \in \mathrm{Int}D_i$ in the case $i = 1, 2$ and $x_0 \in D_3$ in the case of $i = 3$ satisfying that $\widehat{h}_i(x_0;\lambda_i) = \widehat{h}_{i,\max}$, and the partial derivatives of $\widehat{h}_i(x;\lambda_i)$ up to order $N-1$ at x_0 are zero.*

(S2) $|\lambda_i|(\widehat{m}_{i,\max} - \widehat{m}_{i,\min}) < \inf_{x\in\bar{D}_i} \int_{D_i} \kappa(y-x)dy$ *in the case of $i = 2$, and* $|\lambda_i|(\widehat{m}_{i,\max} - \widehat{m}_{i,\min}) < 1$ *in the case of $i = 1, 3$.*

(S3) $\displaystyle\int_{D_i} \frac{1}{\widehat{h}_{i,\max} - \widehat{h}_i(x;\lambda_i)} dx = \infty$ *for $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

Note that, if $|\lambda_i| \ll 1$, then the condition (S2) is automatically satisfied for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Note also that (S1) implies (S3), and when $i = 1$ or 3, (S3) holds if and only if $\displaystyle\int_{D_i} \frac{1}{\widehat{m}_{i,\max} - \widehat{m}_i(x)} dx = \infty$.

Proposition 3.6. *(1) For given $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, if (S1) or (S2) or (S3) is satisfied, then $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ is the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i$.*

(2) For given $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, if $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ is not the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i$, then

$$\mu_i^n(\lambda_i) = \widehat{h}_{i,\max}.$$

Proof. (1) The result that (S1) and (S2) are sufficient conditions for $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ to be the principal eigenvalue follows from the argument in Theorem B in [46]. (S3) is a sufficient condition for $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i)$ to be the principal eigenvalue follows from [15, Theorem 1.1] and Proposition 3.5.

(2) It follows from Proposition 3.5. □

The next proposition is essential to prove our main theorems. Each property in the proposition is also of independent interest.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $1 \le i \le 3$.*

(1) Assume $m_i, m_{i,k} \in \mathcal{X}_i$ with $\lambda_i^k m_{i,k} \to \lambda_i m_i$ as $k \to \infty$ in $\mathcal{X}_i$. Then $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^k m_{i,k}) \to \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i)$ as $k \to \infty$.

(2) We have $\mu_i^n(0) < 0$ for $i = 1$, and $\mu_i^n(0) = 0$ for $i = 2, 3$.

(3) If $\lambda_i^1 m_i^1(t,x) \le \lambda_i^2 m_i^2(t,x)$, then $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^1 m_i^1) \le \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^2 m_i^2)$. If, in addition, $\lambda_i^1 m_i^1(t,x) \not\equiv \lambda_i^2 m_i^2(t,x)$, then $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^1 m_i^1) < \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^2 m_i^2)$.

(4) If $\mathcal{P}(m_i) = \int_0^T \max_{x\in\bar{D}_i} m_i(t,x)dt > 0$, then $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) > 0$ for $\lambda \gg 1$.

(5) The mapping $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i m_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ is convex.

Proof. (1) follows from [46, Proposition 3.11].

(2) In the case of $\lambda_i = 0$, $\mu_i^n(0)$ is the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_i$, since the condition (S2) holds. And by Proposition 3.4 (1), $\mu_i^n(0)$ is the principal eigenvalue of $K_i - B_i$, associated with an eigenfunction $\phi_i \in X_i^{++}$, such that

$$\int_D \kappa(y-x)\phi_1(y)dy - \phi_1(x) = \mu_1^n(0)\phi_1(x) \tag{3.13}$$

in the Dirichlet boundary condition case,

$$\int_D \kappa(y-x)\phi_2(y)dy - \int_D k(y-x)dy\phi_2(x) = \mu_2^n(0)\phi_2(x) \tag{3.14}$$

in the Neumann boundary condition case, and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(y-x)\phi_3(y)dy - \phi_3(x) = \mu_3^n(0)\phi_3(x) \tag{3.15}$$

in the periodic boundary condition case. In the Neumann and periodic boundary condition cases, we have that $(\mu_2^n(0), \phi_2) = (0, 1)$ and $(\mu_3^n(0), \phi_3) = (0, 1)$ are eigenpairs, respectively. Hence $\mu_i^n(0) = 0$ for $i = 2, 3$. In the Dirichlet boundary case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_1^n(0)\int_D \phi_1^2(x)dx &= \int_D\int_D \kappa(y-x)\phi_1(y)\phi_1(x)dydx\phi_1 - \int_D \phi_1^2(x)dx \\
&\le \int_D\int_D \kappa(y-x)\phi_1(y)\phi_1(x)dydx - \int_D\int_D \kappa(y-x)\phi_1^2(x)dydx \\
&= \int_D\int_D \kappa(y-x)\Big[\phi_1(y)\phi_1(x) - \frac{\phi_1^2(x)+\phi_1^2(y)}{2}\Big]dydx \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}\int_D\int_D \kappa(y-x)(\phi_1(x)-\phi_1(y))^2dydx.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\mu_1^n(0) < 0$. Hence the proof is complete.

(3) Suppose that $m_i^1, m_i^2 \in \mathcal{X}_i$, and $\lambda_2^1 m_i^1 \le \lambda_i^2 m_i^2$. By Proposition 3.1 (3), for any $u_0 \in X_i^+$ and $t \ge s$,

$$\Phi_i(t, s; \lambda_i^1 m_i^1)u_0 \le \Phi_i(t, s; \lambda_i^2 m_{i,}^2).$$

This implies that

$$r(\Phi_i(t, s; \lambda_i^1 m_i^1)) \le r(\Phi_i(t, s; \lambda_i^2 m_i^2)).$$

By Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^1 m_i^1) \le \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^2 m_i^2).$$

(4) Assume that $\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_i(t)dt = \int_0^T \max_{x\in D_i} m_i(t, x)dt > 0$, and we need to show that $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i) > 0$ when $\lambda_i \gg 1$. We will prove the case of $i = 1$, since other cases can be proved similarly.

By the continuity of $m_1(t, x)$, there are $\delta > 0$, $x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1} \in D$, $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_n = T$, $r_0, r_1, \cdots, r_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and $m_0, m_1, \cdots, m_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\cup_{i=0}^{i=n-1} B(x_i, r_i) \subset D$, and for $i = 0, 1, \cdots, n-1$

$$m_i + \delta \le m_1(t, x) \le \widetilde{m}_1(t) \quad \text{for} \quad t_i \le t \le t_{i+1},\ x \in B(x_i, r_i),$$

and

$$m_0(t_1 - t_0) + m_1(t_2 - t_1) + \cdots m_{n-1}(t_n - t_{n-1}) > 0.$$

Let $\bar{u}(t,x)$ be the function defined as follows: for $t_0 \le t < t_1$,

$$\bar{u}(t,x) = \begin{cases} e^{\lambda m_0 t} & \text{for } x \in B(x_0, r_0), \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in \bar{D} \setminus B(x_0, r_0), \end{cases}$$

for $t_i \le t < t_{i+1} (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1)$,

$$\bar{u}(t,x) = \begin{cases} e^{\lambda[m_0(t_1-t_0)+m_1(t_2-t_1)+\cdots m_{i-1}(t_i-t_{i-1})]+\lambda m_i t} & \text{for } x \in B(x_i, r_i), \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in \bar{D} \backslash B(x_i, r_i), \end{cases}$$

and for $0 \le t < T$ and $k = 1, 2, \cdots$,

$$\bar{u}(kT + t, x) = \bar{u}(kT, x)\bar{u}(t, x), \quad x \in \bar{D}.$$

We then have that for any $x \in \bar{D}$, $\bar{u}(t,x)$ is differentiable in t at all t but $t_i + kT$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$ and $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Moreover, for $\lambda \gg 1$, any $t_i + kT < t < t_{i+1} + kT$, and any $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{u}_t(t,x) - \left[\int_D \kappa(y-x)\bar{u}(t,y)dy - \bar{u}(t,x) + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x)\bar{u}(t,x) \right] \\ &\le \bar{u}(t,x)\lambda_1 m_i - [-\bar{u}(t,x) + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x)\bar{u}(t,x)] \\ &= \bar{u}(t,x)\lambda_1[m_i - m_1(t,x)] + \bar{u}(t,x) \\ &= \bar{u}(t,x)[\lambda(m_i - m(t,x)) + 1] \\ &\le 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda \gg 1$, where $i = 0, 1, \cdots, n-1$, $k = 0, 1, \cdots$. Then by Proposition 3.1, for $\lambda \gg 1$, $t \ge 0$ and $x \in \bar{D}$, we have

$$u(t, x; u_0) \ge \bar{u}(t, x)$$

for any $u_0 \in X_1^+$ with $u_0(x) \ge \bar{u}(0, x)$. For $\lambda \gg 1$, it then follows from Proposition 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1^n(\lambda_1) &\ge \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\ln \|\bar{u}(t,\cdot)\|_\infty}{t} \\ &= \frac{m_0(t_1 - t_0) + m_1(t_2 - t_1) + \cdots + m_{n-1}(t_n - t_{n-1})}{T} \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is thus complete.

(5) It suffices to show that for any $0 \le \lambda_i^1 < \lambda_i^2$,

$$\mu_i^n \left(\frac{\lambda_i^1 + \lambda_i^2}{2} \right) \le \frac{\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1) + \mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)}{2}. \tag{3.16}$$

Fix $0 \le \lambda_i^1 < \lambda_i^2$. By Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.6, there are $m_i^{1,k}, m_i^{2,k} \in \mathcal{X}_i$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$ such that

$$m_i(t,x) \le m_i^{j,k}(t,x) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2,\ k = 1, 2, 3, \cdots,$$
$$m_i^{j,k} \to m_i \quad \text{as } k \to \infty$$

in $\mathcal{X}_i$ $(j = 1, 2)$, and $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^j m_i^{j,k})$ is the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^j m_i^{j,k}$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. It then suffices to prove

$$\mu_i^n \left(\frac{\lambda_i^1 + \lambda_i^2}{2} \right) \le \frac{\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^1 m_i^{1,k}) + \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^2 m_i^{2,k})}{2}. \tag{3.17}$$

Fix $k \geq 1$. Let $\mu_i^{n,j,k} = \mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^j m_i^{j,k})$ $(j = 1, 2)$. Suppose that $\phi_i^{j,k}$ are positive eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^j m_i^{j,k}$ corresponding to $\mu_i^{n,j,k}$. Let $\phi_i^k = \sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}\phi_i^{2,k}}$. Note that $u_i^{1,k}(t,x) = e^{\mu_i^{n,j,k}t}\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)$ is a solution of

$$u_t = \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - b_i(x)u(t,x) + \lambda_i^1 m_i^{1,k}(t,x)u(t,x),$$

and $u_i^{2,k}(t,x) = e^{\mu_i^{n,j,k}t}\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)$ is a solution of

$$u_t = \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - b_i(x)u(t,x) + \lambda_i^2 m_i^{2,k}(t,x)u(t,x),$$

where $D = \mathbb{R}^N$ in the periodic boundary condition case. Let

$$u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x) = e^{\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}t}\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x)\\
=&\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}e^{\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}t}\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}\\
&+e^{\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}t}\frac{\partial_t\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)+\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\partial_t\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}{2\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}}\\
=&e^{\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}t}\frac{\int_D \kappa(y-x)[\phi_i^{1,k}(t,y)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)+\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,y)]dy}{2\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}}\\
&+e^{\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}t}\frac{-2b_i\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)+(\lambda_i^1 m_i^{1,k}+\lambda_i^2 m_i^{2,k})\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}{2\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}}\\
\geq&e^{\frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}t}\frac{\int_D \kappa(y-x)\left(2\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,y)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,y)}\right)dy}{2\sqrt{\phi_i^{1,k}(t,x)\phi_i^{2,k}(t,x)}}\\
&-b_i(x)u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x)+\frac{\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}{2}m_i(t,x)u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x)\\
\geq&\int_D \kappa(y-x)u_i^{1,2,k}(t,y)dy - b_i(x)u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x)+\frac{\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}{2}m_i(t,x)u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $u_i^{1,2,k}$ is a positive super-solution of

$$u_t = \int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - b_i(x)u(t,x) + \frac{\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}{2}m_i(t,x)u(t,x).$$

This together with Propositions 3.1 and 3.3 implies that

$$\mu_i^n\left(\frac{\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}{2}\right) \leq \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\ln u_i^{1,2,k}(t,x)}{t} = \frac{\mu_i^{n,1,k}+\mu_i^{n,2,k}}{2}.$$

This proves (3.17). Letting $k \to \infty$. we get (3.16). □

Corollary 3.1. *Assume that $m_i(t,x) \not\equiv m_i(t)$ and $0 \leq \lambda_1^1 < \lambda_i^2$. If $\mu_i^n(\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^j m_i)$ $(j = 1, 2)$ are the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_i + \lambda_i^j m_i$, then*

$$\mu_i^n\left(\frac{\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}{2}\right) < \frac{\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1)+\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)}{2}.$$

Proof. We denote the principal eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_i+\lambda_i^1 m_i$ and $\mathcal{L}_i+\lambda_i^2 m_i$ by $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1)$ and $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)$, respectively. Let ϕ_i^j be a positive eigenfunction of $\mathcal{L}_i+\lambda_i^j m_i$ $(j=1,2)$. By the assumption that $m_i(t,x)\not\equiv m_i(t)$, we have $\frac{\phi_i^1(t,x)}{\phi_i^2(t,x)}\not\equiv$constant. In fact, if $\phi_i^1(t,x)=c\phi_i^2(t,x)$ for some $c>0$, then we have

$$\mathcal{L}_i\phi_i^1(t,x)+\lambda_i^1 m_i(t,x)\phi_i^1(t,x)=\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1)\phi_i^1(t,x)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_i\phi_i^1(t,x)+\lambda_i^2 m_i(t,x)\phi_i^1(t,x)=\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)\phi_i^1(t,x).$$

It then follows that

$$\lambda_i^1 m_i(t,x)\phi_i^1(t,x)-\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1)\phi_i^1(t,x)=\lambda_i^2 m_i(t,x)\phi_i^1(t,x)-\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)\phi_i^1(t,x).$$

This implies that

$$m_i(t,x)=\frac{\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1)-\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)}{\lambda_i^1-\lambda_i^2}\equiv\text{constant}$$

This is a contradiction. Hence $\frac{\phi_i^1(t,x)}{\phi_i^2(t,x)}\not\equiv$constant.

We then have

$$\frac{\phi_i^1(t,y)\phi_i^2(t,x)+\phi_i^1(t,y)\phi_i^2(t,x)}{2\sqrt{\phi_i^1(t,x)\phi_i^2(t,x)}}>\sqrt{\phi_i^1(t,y)\phi_i^2(t,y)}.$$

By the arguments of Proposition 3.7, we have

$$\mu_i^n\left(\frac{\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}{2}\right)<\frac{\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^1)+\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^2)}{2}.$$

The corollary is thus proved. □

4 Proofs of the main results

In this section, we prove our main results.

4.1 Dirichlet boundary condition case

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. (1) We first assume that there is $\lambda_1^p>0$ such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p)=0$, and prove that (D) holds, that is $\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_1(t)dt=\int_0^T\max_{x\in\bar{D}_1}m_1(t,x)dt>0$.

Assume that $\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_1(t)dt\le 0$. For any $\lambda_1>0$, we use $\widetilde{\mu}_1^n(\lambda_1)$ to denote the principal spectrum point of the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases}-\partial_t u+\int_{D_1}\kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy-u(t,x)+\lambda_1\widetilde{m}_1(t)u=\widetilde{\mu}_1 u & \text{in } \bar{D},\\ u(t+T,x)=u(t,x).\end{cases}$$

By Proposition 3.4 (2), we have

$$\widetilde{\mu}_1^n(\lambda_1)=\mu_i^n(0)+\frac{\lambda_1}{T}\int_0^T\widetilde{m}(t)dt,$$

where $\mu_1^n(0)<0$ by Proposition 3.7(2). And by Proposition 3.7(3), we have

$$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1)\le\widetilde{\mu}_1^n(\lambda_1),$$

since $m_1(t,x) \le \widetilde{m}_1(t)$ and $\lambda_1 > 0$. Hence $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) < 0$ for any $\lambda \ge 0$. This is a contradiction. Hence $\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_1(t)dt > 0$.

Next, we assume that (D) holds, and prove that there is a unique $\lambda_1^p > 0$ such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p) = 0$.

According to Proposition 3.7(2), $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) < 0$ for $\lambda_1 = 0$. Meanwhile, from Proposition 3.7(4), we have $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) > 0$ for $\lambda \gg 1$. Thus there is $\lambda_1^p > 0$ such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p) = 0$.

(2) Suppose there exist $0 < \lambda_1^{p,1} \le \lambda_1^{p,2}$ such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = 0$. We need to show that $\lambda_1^{p,1} = \lambda_1^{p,2}$. Assume that $\lambda_1^{p,1} < \lambda_1^{p,2}$. By the convexity of $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1)$, $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) = 0$ for $\lambda_1^{p,1} \le \lambda_1 \le \lambda_1^{p,2}$.

If $m_1(t,x) \equiv m_1(t)$, we have $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = \mu_1^n(0) + \lambda_1^{p,1}\widehat{m}_1 = 0$ and $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = \mu_1^n(0) + \lambda_1^{p,2}\widehat{m}_1 = 0$. Note that $\mu_1^n(0) < 0$. We then must have $\widehat{m}_1 > 0$ and then

$$0 = \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = \mu_1^n(0) + \lambda_1^{p,1}\widehat{m}_1 < \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = \mu_1^n(0) + \lambda_1^{p,2}\widehat{m}_1 = 0.$$

This is a contradiction. Hence $\lambda_1^{p,1} = \lambda_1^{p,2}$.

Suppose that $m_1(t,x) \not\equiv m_1(t)$. Assume that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1})$ is the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1^{p,1}m_1$. Then for $\lambda_1 > \lambda_1^{p,1}$ with $\lambda_1 - \lambda_1^{p,1} \ll 1$, $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1)$ is also the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1 m_1$. By Corollary 3.1, we have $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) < 0$ for λ_1 with $\lambda_1 - \lambda_1^{p,1} \ll 1$. This is a contradiction. Hence $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1})$ is not the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1^{p,1}m_1$. Similarly, $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2})$ is not the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1^{p,2}m_1$. We then have that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1})$ and $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2})$ are not eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1^{p,1}m_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1^{p,2}m_1$, respectively. By Proposition 3.6 (2), we have

$$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = h_{1,\max}(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = -1 + \lambda_1^{p,1}m_{1,\max},$$

and

$$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = h_{1,\max}(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = -1 + \lambda_1^{p,2}m_{1,\max}.$$

It thus follows that $\lambda_1^{p,1} = \lambda_1^{p,2}$ if $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,1}) = \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^{p,2}) = 0$. This is also a contradiction.

Therefore, $\lambda_1^{p,1} = \lambda_1^{p,2}$. □

Proof of Corollary 2.1. (1) Assume that $m_1(t,x) \equiv m_1(t)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(m_1) = \int_0^T m_1(t)dt$ and

$$\mu_1^n(\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1 m_1) = \mu_1^n(0) + \lambda_1\widehat{m}_1.$$

(1) then follows from Theorem 2.1.

(2) Assume that $m_1(t,x) \equiv m_1(x)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(m_1) = T \cdot \max_{x\in\bar{D}_1} m_1(x)$. Then (2) follows from Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 3.4. □

4.2 Neumann boundary condition case

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We first prove (2).

Suppose that there exist $0 < \lambda_2^{p,1} \le \lambda_2^{p,2}$ such that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,1}) = \mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,2}) = 0$. We need to show that $\lambda_2^{p,1} = \lambda_2^{p,2}$.

Assume that $\lambda_2^{p,1} < \lambda_2^{p,2}$. By the convexity of $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)$, $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2) = 0$ for $\lambda_2^{p,1} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_2^{p,2}$.

By the similar argument as in the Dirichlet boundary case, $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,1})$ and $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,2})$ are not eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_2 + \lambda_2^{p,1}m_2$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 + \lambda_2^{p,2}m_2$, respectively (the assumption $m_2(t,x) \not\equiv m_2(t)$ is used here). By Proposition 3.6 (2), we have

$$\mu_2^n(\lambda) = \widehat{h}_{2,\max}(\lambda) = \max_{x\in\bar{D}_2}[-b_2(x) + \lambda\widehat{m}_2(x)] = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in [\lambda_2^{p,1}, \lambda_2^{p,2}],$$

where $b_2(x) = \int_D \kappa(y-x)dy$. Let $x_\lambda \in \bar{D}_2$ be such that

$$\max_{x\in\bar{D}_2}[-b_2(x) + \lambda\widehat{m}_2(x)] = -b_2(x_\lambda) + \lambda\widehat{m}_2(x_\lambda) = \mu_2^n(\lambda) = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

for $\lambda \in [\lambda_2^{p,1}, \lambda_2^{p,2}]$. Note that $-b_2(x) < 0$ for any $x \in \bar{D}_2$. Hence we must have $\widehat{m}_2(x_\lambda) > 0$. In particular, $\widehat{m}_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,1}}) > 0$. We then have

$$-b_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,1}}) + \lambda_2^{p,1}\widehat{m}_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,1}}) < -b_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,1}}) + \lambda_2^{p,2}\widehat{m}_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,1}}) \le -b_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,2}}) + \lambda_2^{p,2}\widehat{m}_2(x_{\lambda_2^{p,2}}),$$

which contradicts to (4.1).

It thus follows that $\lambda_2^{p,1} = \lambda_2^{p,2}$ if $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,1}) = \mu_2^n(\lambda_2^{p,2}) = 0$.

Next, we prove (1).

First suppose that there is $\lambda_2^p > 0$ such that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^p) = 0$. We prove that $\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_2(t)dt > 0$ and $\int_D \widehat{m}_2(x)dx < 0$ with $\widetilde{m}_2(t) = \max_{x\in\bar{D}_2} m_2(t,x)$ and $\widehat{m}_2(x) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T m_2(t,x)dt$.

Assume that $\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_2(t)dt \le 0$. Note that $m_2(t,x) \le \widetilde{m}_2(t)$ and $m_2(t,x) \not\equiv \tilde{m}_2(t)$. Hence, by Proposition 3.4(2) and Proposition 3.7(3), we have

$$\mu_2^n(\lambda_2) < \lambda_2\frac{\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_2(t)dt}{T} \le 0$$

for $\lambda_2 > 0$. This is a contradiction. Therefore $\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_2(t)dt > 0$.

Proposition 3.7, together with $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^p) = 0$ and (2), leads to $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2) < 0$ for $0 < \lambda_2 \ll 1$. Note that for $|\lambda_2| \ll 1$, $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)$ is a principal eigenvalue, associated with a positive eigenfunction, denoted by $\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)$. Then

$$-\frac{\partial_t\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)} + \int_{D_2}\kappa(y-x)\frac{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) - \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)}dy + \lambda_2 m_2(t,x) = \mu_2^n(\lambda_2).$$

Hence for $0 < \lambda_2 \ll 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)\cdot T\cdot|D_2| - \lambda_2 T\int_{D_2}\widehat{m}_2(x)dx\\
&= \int_0^T\int_{D_2}\int_{D_2}\kappa(y-x)\frac{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) - \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)}dydxdt\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{D_2}\int_{D_2}\kappa(y-x)\Big[\frac{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) - \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)} + \frac{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x) - \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y)}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y)}\Big]dydxdt\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{D_2}\int_{D_2}\kappa(y-x)\frac{(\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) - \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x))^2}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y)}dydxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $m_2(t,x) \not\equiv m_2(t)$, $\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) \not\equiv \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)$. We then have

$$0 > \mu_2^n(\lambda_2)\cdot T\cdot|D_2| > \lambda_2 T\int_{D_2}\widehat{m}_2(x)dx \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda_2 \ll 1,$$

and then $\int_{D_2}\widehat{m}_2(x)dx < 0$.

Next, suppose that $\int_0^T \widetilde{m}_2(t)dt > 0$ and $\int_{D_2}\widehat{m}_2(x)dx < 0$. We prove that there is $\lambda_2^p > 0$ such that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^p) = 0$.

By Proposition 3.7 (4), $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2) > 0$ for $\lambda_2 \gg 1$. Note that $\mu_2(0) = 0$ and for $0 < \lambda_2 \ll 1$, $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)$ is a principal eigenvalue of (1.2). Suppose that $\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)$ is a positive principal eigenfunction with $\|\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty = 1$. Note that $\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)$ is differentiable in λ_2 and $\phi_2^0(t,x) \equiv 1$. Hence

$$\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) - \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x) = \phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y) - 1 - (\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x) - 1) = O(\lambda_2).$$

Then by the above arguments,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)\cdot T\cdot|D_2|\\
=&\lambda_2\int_{D_2}\widehat{m}_2(x)dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{D_2}\int_{D_2}\kappa(y-x)\frac{(\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y)-\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x))^2}{\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,x)\phi_2^{\lambda_2}(t,y)}dydxdt\\
=&\lambda_2\int_{D_2}\widehat{m}_2(x)dx+O(\lambda_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)<0$ for $0<\lambda_2\ll 1$. Then there is $\lambda_2^p>0$ such that $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2^p)=0$. □

Proof of Corollary 2.2. (1) Assume that $m_2(t,x)\equiv m_2(t)$. Then by Proposition 3.4 (2) and 3.7 (2), we have

$$\mu_2^n(\mathcal{L}_2+\lambda_2 m_2)=\mu_2^n(0)+\lambda_2\widehat{m}_2=\lambda_2\widehat{m}_2.$$

It then follows that if $\widehat{m}_2\neq 0$, then there is no positive principal spectrum point of $\mathcal{L}_2+\lambda_2 m_2$. If $\widehat{m}_2=0$, then every positive λ is a principal spectrum point of $\mathcal{L}_2+\lambda_2 m_2$.

(2) Assume that $m_2(t,x)\equiv m_2(x)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(m_2)=T\cdot\max_{x\in\bar{D}_2}m_2(x)$. (2) then follows from Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 3.4.

□

4.3 Periodic boundary condition case

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.3

Proof of Theorem 2.3. First, (2) can proved by the similar arguments as those in Theorem 2.2(2).

We prove (1) in the following.

Suppose that there is $\lambda_3^p>0$ such that $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3^p)=0$. We prove that $\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_3(t)dt>0$ and $\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx<0$.

Assume that $\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_3(t)dt\leq 0$. Note that $m_3(t,x)\leq\widetilde{m}_3(t)$ and $m_3(t,x)\not\equiv\widetilde{m}_3(t)$. Hence

$$\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)<\frac{\lambda_3}{T}\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_3(t)dt\leq 0$$

for $\lambda_3>0$. This is a contradiction. Therefore $\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_3(t)dt>0$.

Proposition 3.7, together with $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3^p)=0$, leads to $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)<0$ for $0<\lambda_3\ll 1$. Note that for $|\lambda_3|\ll 1$, $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)$ is a principal eigenvalue. Suppose that $\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)$ is a positive principal eigenfunction. Then

$$-\frac{\partial_t\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\kappa(y-x)\frac{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}dy+\lambda_3 m_3(t,x)=\mu_3^n(\lambda_3).$$

Let

$$\widetilde{\kappa}(z)=\sum_{(k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_N)\in\mathbb{Z}^N}\kappa(z+(k_1p_1,k_2p_2,\cdots,k_Np_N)).$$

Then $\widetilde{\kappa}(-z)=\widetilde{\kappa}(z)$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\kappa(y-x)\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)dy=\int_{D_3}\widetilde{\kappa}(y-x)\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)dy.$$

Hence for $0 < \lambda_3 \ll 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)\cdot T\cdot|D_3| - \lambda_3 T\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx\\
&=\int_0^T\int_{D_3}\int_{D_3}\widetilde{\kappa}(y-x)\frac{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}dydxdt\\
&=\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{D_3}\int_{D_3}\widetilde{\kappa}(y-x)\Big[\frac{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)}+\frac{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)}\Big]dydxdt\\
&=\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{D_3}\int_{D_3}\widetilde{\kappa}(y-x)\frac{(\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x))^2}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)}dydxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $m_3(t,x)\not\equiv m_3(t)$, $\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)\not\equiv\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)$. Hence for $0<\lambda_3\ll 1$,

$$0>\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)\cdot T\cdot|D_3|>\lambda_3 T\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx$$

and then $\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx<0$.

Next, suppose that $\int_0^T\widetilde{m}_3(t)dt>0$ and $\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx<0$. We prove that there is $\lambda_3^p>0$ such that $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3^p)=0$.

By Proposition 3.7 (4), $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)>0$ for $\lambda_3\gg 1$. Note that $\mu_3^n(0)=0$ and for $0<\lambda_3\ll 1$, $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)$ is a principal eigenvalue of (1.3). Suppose that $\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)$ is a positive principal eigenfunction with $\|\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty=1$. Note that $\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)$ is differentiable in λ_3 and $\phi_3^0(t,x)\equiv 1$. Hence

$$\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)=\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-1-(\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)-1)=O(\lambda_3).$$

Then by the above arguments,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)\cdot T\cdot|D_3|\\
=&\lambda_3\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{D_3}\int_{D_3}\widetilde{\kappa}(y-x)\frac{(\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)-\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x))^2}{\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,x)\phi_3^{\lambda_3}(t,y)}dydxdt\\
=&\lambda_3\int_{D_3}\widehat{m}_3(x)dx+O(\lambda_3^2).
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)<0$ for $0<\lambda_3\ll 1$. Then there is $\lambda_3^p>0$ such that $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3^p)=0$. □

Proof of Corollary 2.3. It can be proved by a similar argument as in the proof of Corollary 2.2. □

4.4 Upper bounds and the existence of principal eigenvalues

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. (1) First, we prove the upper bound of (2.7) in the case of $i=1$. If (2.17) has a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1)$, we need to show that (2.7) also has a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_1^p(m_1)$, and $\lambda_1^p(m_1)\le\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1)$.

By Corollary 2.1 (2), (2.17) has a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1)$ if and only if

$$\widehat{m}_1(x_0)>0\quad\text{ for some } x_0\in D_1, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\widehat{m}_1(x_0) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T m_1(t,x_0)dt$. Since $\int_0^T m_1(t,x_0)dt \le \int_0^T \max_{x\in\bar{D}_1} m_1(t,x)dt$, we know that $m_1(t,x)$ satisfies (D), that is

$$\mathcal{P}(m_1) = \int_0^T \max_{x\in\bar{D}_1} m_1(t,x)dt > 0.$$

By Theorem 2.1, we know that (2.7) also has a unique positive principal spectrum point $\lambda_1^p(m_1)$.

To prove the upper bound of $\lambda_1^p(m_1)$, denote the principal spectrum point of (2.18) by $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1, \widehat{m}_1)$, and the principal spectrum point of (2.8) by $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1, m_1)$. We have

$$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1), \widehat{m}_1) \le \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1), m_1))$$

by Proposition 3.7 (3). By Definition 2.1, we have

$$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1), \widehat{m}_1) = \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p(m_1), m_1) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p(m_1), m_1) \le \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_1), m_1).$$

By Proposition 3.7 (3), we have

$$\lambda_1^p(m_i) \le \lambda_1^p(\widehat{m}_i).$$

The proof in the case of $i = 2$ or $i = 3$ is similar to the case of $i = 1$. So we omit it.

(2) (i) It follows from the fact that the conditions in (i) imply that (S1) holds.

(ii) It follows from (1) and Proposition 3.6. □

4.5 Applications

In this section, we apply Theorem 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 to study the existence of positive time-periodic solution of the KPP type equations (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14).

Recall the KPP type equation (1.12) ((1.13) or (1.14)) with $f_i(t,x,u)(i = 1,2,3)$ satisfying (F). The eigenvalue problems of (1.12), (1.13), and (1.14) linearized at $u = 0$ are

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \left[\int_D \kappa(y-x)u(t,y)dy - u(t,x)\right] + \lambda_1 m_1(t,x)u(t,x) = \mu_1 u, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x). \\ u(t,x) \ge 0, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

for the Dirichlet boundary condition,

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \int_D \kappa(y-x)[u(t,y) - u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_2 m_2(t,x)u(t,x) = \mu_2 u, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x), \\ u(t,x) \ge 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

for the Neumann boundary condition, and

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(y-x)[u(t,y) - u(t,x)]dy + \lambda_3 m_3(t,x)u(t,x) = \mu_3 u, \\ u(t+T,x) = u(t,x+p_j\mathbf{e_j}) = u(t,x), \\ u(t,x) \ge 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

for the periodic boundary condition, where $m_i(t,x) = f_i(t,x,0)$. It is assumed that m_1, m_2, and m_3 satisfies (D), (N), and (P), respectively.

Denote the principal spectrum point of (4.3), (4.4), and (4.5) by $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1)$, $\mu_2^n(\lambda_2)$, and $\mu_3^n(\lambda_3)$, respectively. Suppose λ_i^p is such that $\mu_i^n(\lambda_i^p) = 0$, we need to show that (1.12) ((1.13) or (1.14)) admits a unique positive time-periodic solution $u^*(t,x)$ if and only if $\lambda_i > \lambda_i^p$.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We only prove the case of $i = 1$, and other cases ($i = 2$ or $i = 3$) can be shown similarly.

First, we show if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_1^p$, then (1.12) admits a unique positive time-periodic solution $u^*(t, x)$. By [46, Theorem E], the KPP type equation (1.12) has a unique positive time periodic solution, if f_1 satisfies the following monostable assumptions:

(H1) *f_1 is C^1 in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and C^3 in $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$; $f_1(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \gg 1$ and $\partial_u f_1(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \geq 0$; $f_1(t + T, x, u) = f_1(t, x, u)$.*

(H2) *$\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) > 0$, where $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1)$ is the principle spectrum point of (4.3).*

The condition (H1) is exactly (F), so we only need to show that (H2) is satisfied if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_1^p$. Since $m_1 = f_1(t, x, 0)$ satisfies (D), we have $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p) = 0$ by Theorem 2.1. Since $\lambda_1 > \lambda_1^p$, we know that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) > \mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p)$ by Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 3.7 (3). It follows that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) > 0$. Hence (H2) is satisfied.

Second, consider (1.12), and we need to show that if (1.12) has a solution, then $\lambda_1 > \lambda_1^p$, where λ_1^p is the unique positive number such that $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1^p) = 0$.

Suppose that (1.12) admits a positive solution $u^*(t, x)$. Then

$$-\partial_t u^*(t, x) + \int_D \kappa(y - x)u^*(t, y)dy - u^*(t, x) + \lambda_1 f_1(t, x, u^*(t, x))u^*(t, x) = 0.$$

This implies that $\mu_1^n(\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_1 m_1^*) = 0$, where $m_1^*(t, x) = f_1(t, x, u^*(t, x))$. Note that $f_1(t, x, 0) > f_1(t, x, u^*(t, x))$. Hence $\mu_1^n(\lambda_1) > 0$. Therefore, $\lambda_1^p < \lambda_1$. □

References

[1] A. Alvino, G. Trombetti, P.-L. Lions, S. Matarasso, Comparison results for solutions of elliptic problems via symmetrization, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linaire 16 (1999), no. 2, 167-188.

[2] F. Andreu-Vaillo, J. M. Mazón, J.D. Rossi, J. Toledo-Melero, Nonlocal diffusion problems, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island, 2010.

[3] P. Bates, G. Zhao, Existence, uniqueness and stability of the stationary solution to a nonlocal evolution equation arising in population dispersal, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **332** (2007), 428–440.

[4] A. Beltramo, P. Hess, On the principal eigenvalue of a periodic-parabolic operator, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **9** (1984), 919-941.

[5] J. Bochenek, On some linear eigenvalue problems with an indefinite weight function, Univ. Iagel. Acta Math. (1988), no. 27, 315-323.

[6] M. Bôcher, The smallest characteristic numbers in a certain exceptional case, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **21** (1914), no. 1, 6-9.

[7] K. J. Brown, C. Cosner, J. Fleckinger, Principal eigenvalues for problems with indefinite weight function on $\mathbb{R}^n$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1990), no. 1, 147-155.

[8] K. J. Brown, S.S. Lin, On the existence of positive eigenfunctions for an eigenvalue problem with indefinite weight function, J. Math. Anal. Appl.**75** (1980), no. 1, 112-120.

[9] R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner. Diffusive logistic equations with indefinite weights: population models in disrupted environments. II., SIAM J. Math. Anal. **22** (1991), no. 4, 1043-1064.

[10] R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner, Spatial ecology via reaction-diffusion equations, Wiley Series in Mathematical and Computational Biology, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2003. ISBN: 0-471-49301-592D40.

[11] R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner. Diffusive logistic equations with indefinite weights: population models in disrupted environments, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **112** (1989), no. 3-4, 293-318.

[12] A. Chmaj, X. Ren, Homoclinic solutions of an integral equation: existence and stability, J. Differential Equations, **155** (1999), no. 1, 17-43.

[13] C. Cosner, Eigenvalue problems with indefinite weights and reaction-diffusion models in population dynamics, Oxford Sci. Publ., Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1990. 35-02.

[14] C. Cosner, F. Cuccu, G. Porru, Optimization of the first eigenvalue of equations with indefinite weights, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **13** (2013), no. 1, 79-95.

[15] J. Coville, On a simple criterion for the existence of a principal eigenfunction of some nonlocal operators, J. Differential Equations, **249** (2010), 2921–2953.

[16] J. Coville, J. Dávila, S. Martínez, Existence and uniqueness of solutions to a nonlocal equation with monostable nonlinearity, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **39** (2008), no. 5, 1693-1709.

[17] D. Daners, Periodic-parabolic eigenvalue problems with indefinite weight functions, Arch. Math. **68** (1997), no. 5, 388-397.

[18] D. E. Edmunds and W. D. Evans, Spectral Theory and Differential Operators, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1987.

[19] L. Evans, Partial differential equations. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 19. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.

[20] E. Feireisl, F. Issard-Roch, H. Petzeltová, A non-smooth version of the Lojasiewicz-Simon theorem with applications to non-local phase-field systems, J. Differential Equations, **199** (2004), no. 1, 1-21.

[21] P. Fife, Some nonclassical trends in parabolic and parabolic-like evolutions, Trends in nonlinear analysis, 153–191, Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[22] R. A. Fisher, The wave of advance of advantageous genes, Ann. Eugen., 7 (1937), 335-369.

[23] J. García-Melán and J. D. Rossi, On the principal eigenvalue of some nonlocal diffusion problems, J. Differential Equations, **246** (2009), 21–38.

[24] J.-P. Gossez, E. Lami Dozo, On the principal eigenvalue of a second order linear elliptic problem, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **89** (1985), no. 2, 169-175.

[25] M. Grinfeld, G. Hines, V. Hutson, K. Mischaikow and G. T. Vickers, Non-local dispersal, *Differential Integral Equations*, **18** (2005), 1299–1320.

[26] K.P. Hadeler, Reaction transport systems in biological modelling, in Mathematics inspired by biology, Lecture Notes in Math., 1714, Springer, Berlin, 1999.

[27] P. Hess, On the spectrum of elliptic operators with respect to indefinite weights, Proceedings of the symposium on operator theory (Athens, 1985), Linear Algebra Appl. **84** (1986), 99-109.

[28] P. Hess, Periodic-parabolic boundary value problems and positivity, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, 247. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow; copublished in the United States with John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1991. ISBN: 0-582-06478-3

[29] P. Hess, T. Kato, On some linear and nonlinear eigenvalue problems with an indefinite weight function, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **5** (1980), no. 10, 999-1030.

[30] P. Hess and H. Weinberger, Convergence to spatial-temporal clines in the Fisher equation with time-periodic fitnesses, J. Math. Biol. 28 (1990), no. 1, 83-98.

[31] G. Hetzer, W. Shen and A. Zhang, Effects of spatial variations and dispersal strategies on principal eigenvalues of dispersal operators and spreading speeds of monostable equations, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics, **43** (2013), 489–513.

[32] M. Hintermüller, C.-Y. Kao, A. Laurain, Principal eigenvalue minimization for an elliptic problem with indefinite weight and Robin boundary conditions, Appl. Math. Optim. **65** (2012), no. 1, 111-146.

[33] V. Hutson, M. Grinfeld, Non-local dispersal and bistability, *European J. Appl. Math.*, **17** (2006), no. 2, 221232.

[34] V. Hutson, S. Martinez, K. Mischaikow and G. T. Vickers, The evolution of dispersal, J. Math. Biol., **47** (2003), 483–517.

[35] V. Hutson, W. Shen and G. T. Vickers, Spectral theory for nonlocal dispersal with periodic or almost-periodic time dependence, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics, **38** (2008), 1147–1175.

[36] C.-Y. Kao, Y. Lou and W. Shen, Random dispersal vs non-Local dispersal, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, **26** (2010), 551–596.

[37] C.-Y. Kao, Y. Lou, E. Yanagida, Principal eigenvalue for an elliptic problem with indefinite weight on cylindrical domains, Math. Biosci. Eng. **5** (2008), no. 2, 315-335.

[38] A. Kolmogorov, I. Petrowsky, N. Piscunov, A study of the equation of diffusion with increase in the quantity of matter, and its application to a biological problem, Bjul. Moskovskogo Gos, Univ., 1(6): 1-25 (1937).

[39] J. López-Gómez, On linear weighted boundary value problems. Partial differential equations(Hansur-Lesse, 1993), 188-203, Math. Res., 82, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

[40] J. López-Gómez, The maximum principle and the existence of principal eigenvalues for some linear weighted boundary value problems, J. Differential Equations **127** (1996), no. 1, 263-294.

[41] Y. Lou, Yuan, E. Yanagida Minimization of the principal eigenvalue for an elliptic boundary value problem with indefinite weight, and applications to population dynamics, Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math. **23** (2006), no. 3, 275-292.

[42] A. Manes, A. M. Micheletti, Un'estensione della teoria variazionale classica degli autovalori per operatori ellittici del secondo ordine. Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. (4) **7** (1973), 285-301.

[43] G. Nadin, Existence and uniqueness of the solutions of a space-time periodic reaction-diffusion equation, J. Differential Equation 249 (2010), no. 6, 1288-1304.

[44] G. Nadin The principal eigenvalue of a space-time periodic parabolic operator, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. ,**4** 188 (2009), no. 2 269–295.

[45] H. G. Othmer, S. R. Dunbar, W. Alt, Models of dispersal in biological systems, J. Math. Biol., **26** (1988), no. 3, 263298.

[46] N. Rawal and W. Shen, Criteria for the existence and lower bounds of principal eigenvalues of time periodic nonlocal dispersal operators and applications, J. Dynam. Differential Equations, **24** (2012), 927–954.

[47] S. Senn, P. Hess, On positive solutions of a linear elliptic eigenvalue problem with Neumann boundary conditions, Math. Ann.**258** (1981), no. 4, 459-470.

[48] W. Shen and X. Xie, On principal spectrum points/principal eigenvalues of nonlocal dispersal operators and applications, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **35** (2015), no. 4, 1665-1696.

[49] W. Shen and X. Xie, Approximations of random dispersal operators/equations by nonlocal dispersal operators/equations, *Journal of Differential Equations*, to appear.

[50] k W. Shen and A. Zhang, Spreading speeds for monostable equations with nonlocal dispersal in space periodic habitats, Journal of Differential Equations **249** (2010), 747–795.

[51] I. Stoleriu, Integro-differential equations in materials science, Ph.D thesis, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 2001.

[52] X.-Q. Zhao, Global attractivity and stability in some monotone discrete dynamical systems, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 53 (1996), no. 2, 305-324.